

Cover to
be redone

E P I S C O P A L B I S H O P S

A N D C H U R C H L E A D E R S H I P I N T H E E I G H T I E S

Committee on Pastoral Development
of the House of Bishops



Principal Investigators:

The Right Reverend Charles Vaché, Director, Study of Episcopal Bishops and Church Leadership in the Eighties.

The Right Reverend David Richards, Director of the Office of Pastoral Development, House of Bishops.

Adair T. Lummis, Ph.D., Coordinator of Research on Episcopal Bishops and Church Leadership.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Forward</u>	
I. OVERVIEW: THE CHURCH IN THE EIGHTIES	
A. <u>Purpose and Design of the Study</u>	1
B. <u>Bishops and Diocesan Councils in the Eighties as Compared to the Seventies: A Happier Picture Now</u>	2
1. A Calmer Church and Society Scene	2
2. Introducing Bishops in the Eighties	4
C. <u>In Team with the Bishop: Diocesan Council in the Eighties</u>	5
1. Some Characteristics of Diocesan Council	5
2. The Council Working Together	6
D. <u>General Orientations and Opinions About the Church.</u>	9
1. Orientations to Theology and the Use of Conflicts to Achieve Wanted Social Change	9
2. Opinions About the Church	10
3. Should the Church make Position Statements, and if so, on What?	13
II. DIOCESAN TRENDS AND PRESENT CONDITIONS	
A. <u>Trends in Diocesan Conditions as Perceived by Bishops and Council Members</u>	16
B. <u>The Dilemma of Diocesan Size</u>	20
III. THE ELECTION OF BISHOPS	
A. <u>Varieties in the Election Process</u>	40

B.	<u>Differences Among Dioceses Which Have Used the More Complete Election Process and Among Bishops Who Have Been Elected to Diocese Using the More Complete versus the More Simplistic Election Process</u>	29
C.	<u>Table Appendix on Election of a Bishop</u>	
IV.	BISHOPS AS LEADERS: EPISCOPAL LEADERSHIP STYLE AND EXPECTED DIOCESAN GOVERNANCE	
A.	<u>Bishops' Leadership Styles or the Norm of Collegiality</u>	34
B.	<u>Others' Expectations of How the Diocese is to be Governed</u>	40
C.	<u>Table Appendix on Governance Type Expected</u>	
V.	THE ROLES OF A BISHOP: WHAT A BISHOP DOES AND HOW HE DOES IT	
A.	<u>Bishops' Role Priorities: Roles Emphasized, Preferred and Delegated</u>	45
B.	<u>Particular Episcopal Roles Explored in Interviews with Bishops</u>	50
1.	Being a Prophet: Stirrer of the Conscience of People on Social Behavior and Public Policy	50
2.	Being a Chief Pastor to the People Versus Being Administrator of the Diocese	53
3.	Being a Judge of and Pastor to Clergy	56
4.	Being a Preacher	59
5.	Being a Gatekeeper to the Ordained Ministry	61
VI.	ADMIRER CHARACTERISTICS OF BISHOPS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF BISHOPS WHO ARE EFFECTIVE AND ADMIRER	
A.	<u>Admired Characteristics of Bishops</u>	65
B.	<u>Bishops' Effectiveness in Doing Their Diocesan Ministries</u>	67
C.	<u>Improving the Effectiveness of Bishops</u>	70

VII. MOVING FROM PRIEST TO BISHOP: THE PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL LIVES OF BISHOPS

A. Alterations in Professional Life 74

 1. Relationships with Clergy 75

 2. Getting professional support and critique. 77

B. Alterations in Personal Life 80

C. Loneliness in the Smaller Dioceses Revisited 85

VIII. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Recommendations. 87

B. Summary and Discussion 90

NOTES 94

Appendices

1. Table Appendix
2. Report: "Wives of Bishops in the Eighties"

IV. BISHOPS AS LEADERS: EPISCOPAL LEADERSHIP STYLE AND EXPECTED DIOCESAN GOVERNANCE

A. Bishops' Leadership Styles or the Norm of Collegiality

Bishops were asked in interviews a number of questions concerning their leadership style--how they would describe it, how they developed it, whether they altered the style occasionally to suit different occasions or groups, and what the reactions had been in their dioceses to their particular style.

Of the 61 bishops interviewed, all but two said they had a collegial leadership style, characterized typically by: shared decision-making; delegation of authority to give oversight and direction to various planning and policy areas to others in their dioceses; and high involvement of diocesan commission, committees, staff, lay and clergy leaders generally in the work of the diocese. Bishops see themselves primarily as enabling the ministry of others, and several used the term "mautic" in likening themselves to midwives in the birthing of various innovations and new programs. However, within this collegial framework, bishops' descriptions of their styles do suggest that there is some variation, for example, from collegial-directive to collegial-nondirective.

Bishops typically have developed their collegial style over some years, the majority as a rector in charge of a multi-staffed parish. About fifteen bishops either developed their collegial leadership style or refined it through participation in continuing education programs, especially those programs dealing with group dynamics and leadership skills. In this regard, "Group Life Labs," and the Church Executive Program of the American University were most frequently mentioned. About ten bishops also said they developed their style at least in part through time in a non-church position, half of these through their military experience.

The great majority of bishops said that one reason they use a collegial style is because it is comfortable for them and it does appear to have good results. About

one-fifth of the interviewed bishops also indicated that they used a collegial style because they believed it was more theologically justifiable than an authoritative style. At the same time, many bishops noted that there were some obstacles to using a collegial style effectively and possible negative consequences for the bishop attempting to use it.

In order to use a collegial leadership style effectively in the way of effectively delegating responsibility for getting a job done and decision-making power over how it is done, there have to be willing, competent, responsible people--be they laity or clergy, salaried by the Church or volunteers--to whom to delegate such tasks. This was generally seen as the major obstacle to using a collegial leadership style effectively. It is probably not surprising that this obstacle was most likely to be reported by bishops in the smaller dioceses, with few staff, quite restricted budgets, and often geographically dispersed dioceses. Another obstacle mentioned by some bishops was a recent history of a predecessor using an authoritative, if not actually authoritarian, leadership style, making it harder for the new bishop to get people used to a new style of leadership. A third obstacle, sometimes made more acute when the bishop prior was more directive than the present one, is the greater length of time it takes to make decisions by the collegial, participatory method than by a more directive style. The greater length of time to reach decisions when decisions are made by committee, plus the usually accompanying lack of direction given by the bishop on what decisions he feels should be made, may result in some diocesan leaders among the clergy and laity seeing their bishop as weak or indecisive.

Despite such obstacles and potential drawbacks to using a collegial style, interviewed bishops in great majority said their use of a participatory, collegial leadership style has yielded positive results on the whole for their dioceses. Most often mentioned as being beneficial consequences of bishops' using a collegial style were getting more people involved in the life and leadership of the diocese, improving morale among clergy and lay leaders about the diocese, and freeing up the bishop from some areas so that they could devote more time to other areas, or simply be less overburdened and thus better diocesans. Also, the bishops' use of a collegial style was believed by them to draw forth greater creativity from others in the dioceses and to increase communication and cooperation among and between groups and individuals in the dioceses. Several bishops indicated that the last could be realized through the bishop's consistent and effective use of a collegial, participatory leadership style. If he also explains and advocates its use, he acts

as a role model for other diocesan leaders who then adopt a collegial leadership style with the commissions and committees which they chair or in working groups they supervise.

About half of the bishops said that while they mainly used a collegial style, there were some occasions and with some groups where they employed a more directive style. Some occasions which invoked a more directive style from these bishops were: a staff member not working effectively; a violation of national or diocesan canons; or sometimes a conflict within Vestries, Standing Committee, Commission on Ministry, or diocesan council either generally or on particular issues when the bishop must make a decision.

Most bishops felt that overall clergy and lay leaders in their dioceses liked their style of collegial, participatory decision making, delegation of authority and shared responsibility. Concomitantly, about half of the bishops said that though their style was generally appreciated by most in their dioceses, there were always some who seemed to want a more directive leadership style from the bishop. This desire for more episcopal direction was usually resisted by these bishops, since they noted with some irony that those clergy and laity who wanted more direction from the bishop were also the ones most likely to complain vociferously if the bishop either approved a policy or asked them to take some action which they disliked.

Bishops' collegial leadership style is often, as indicated previously, actually several different styles. For example, some bishops appear to have adopted a rather directive collegial leadership style. They do attempt to gather input from others in the diocese on matters requiring decisions, and they do delegate tasks and leadership responsibilities to others; but at the same time, they are apt to establish clear lines of authority and accountability, which involves others (to whom tasks or decision-making and oversight responsibilities are delegated) making regular reports to and having fairly frequent discussions with the bishop. The following descriptions by bishops illustrate this more directive collegial leadership style:

"I try to appoint the best persons possible for given tasks, give them portfolios, and let things go. But there is clear responsibility and accountability. We have staff meetings twice a month, around four hours each. I do alter this style when it is not functioning well in regard to certain persons--until the situation improves--or I let the person go. This style suits my personality and I have had good 'hands on' leadership. There have not been many complaints though. It is a pretty effective style."

"I committed responsibility for the various areas of the diocese to eight senior staff aides, each of whom serve with a negotiated job description and each of whom had an appointed board or department to whom he or she is also accountable. I meet with these senior staff colleagues for Eucharist and discussion each Tuesday morning. Each of these aides is encouraged to confer with me at any time, without appointment, if it is thought that I could be helpful. My style is, I believe, to be open to any and all ideas, criticisms and suggestions, yet willing to make decisions when decisions seem in order. I use this style because it is becoming to the spirit of the Gospel as I understand it, and because it seems appropriate for one in episcopal office. Senior staff and support staff seem generally pleased with this style. I seem to be perceived as collegial and democratic."

Other bishops appear to have developed a collegial style that is partly directive and partly nondirective. For example, they usually set up structures for decision-making and task accomplishment, as well as design job descriptions for various positions and often appoint the people to fill leadership positions. However, having accomplished this, they tend to withdraw to a large extent, neither seeking to be kept regularly informed about the progress of the task area nor "stepping in" to a delegated area unless problems develop. This type of mixed collegial leadership style is illustrated in the following bishops' descriptions.

"I set directions, request help, and leave people alone with the responsibility. I developed this style after finding out that I could not do everything; I had to let others alone to succeed or fail. Most have reacted positively. At times there are some who wanted me to be clearer, with definite directions on how they should proceed. But I tend to resist that, although with some groups I am more directive and have to keep prodding to get them through the task. This style is effective to the extent that people chosen to take responsibility, follow through. Failure comes when I choose the wrong people."

This mixed style can be weighted toward the laissez-faire collegial leadership way too:

"My style is open, collegial, listening. I preside over the Executive Committee (Diocesan Council), and I attend Standing Committee and Commission on Ministry meetings, but I don't preside, and share with others as a participant in meetings of our program development committee. I have a more laissez-faire attitude and let people work it out themselves--usually. This style is natural for me, and I am comfortable with it. People have responded well, although some want more direction given in certain areas. I try to be pastoral instead of legal, and in the long run this has paid off."

The collegial leadership style can also take the form of almost pure collegiality or democracy. Bishops using this leadership style share the responsibility for designing the procedures, job descriptions, structures for how the decision-making and work of the diocese is to be achieved as well as carrying out the decision-making and work. Bishops using this democratic collegial leadership style also share the supervision of tasks and areas delegated to others with lay and clergy staff and committee members. "Decisions by consensus" could be said to be the motto of those adopting this style, and indeed it is this style's cornerstone. The democratic collegial leadership style is explained in the following bishops' comments:

"I seek consensus in my leadership. Consensus is built by encouraging individual initiative. I chair only the executive council and sit on other bodies as a member. But I have regular, informal meetings with staff and committee leaders and am in touch daily. Some feel I should be more authoritative--especially when dealing with 'other' persons. Overall the reaction has been good. The style is effective because it achieves goals and has built mutual trust."

"I have a collegial leadership style, and I use it everywhere. Even in the Commission on Ministry, decisions are made by consensus with committee members. The past diocesan used to have a style of 'father knows best'; and when I began to use a collegial style, there was reluctance on the part of some for a few years. No others seem happy with it. I learned this style in human relations training and have practiced this style most of my ministry. Management and action by consensus is the only way I feel comfortable in leading the diocese. I model this style for

others. Parish and committee chairs now for the most part have collegial meetings too, although a few balk and keep asking for the bishop to come out and act like 'a bishop'. This is a very effective style--but of course, democracy is always 'inefficient' and slow, but the 'ownership' participants gain through it makes the decisions bear more fruit."

In these descriptions of bishops' leadership styles, what may now be clear is that although for the most part bishops do have a collegial leadership style and in many instances do try to achieve consensus whenever possible, the element of bishop's authority is often there as well. This element of bishop's authority, often underlying or at least latent, in a leadership which is essentially collegial, does not go unnoticed by others in the diocese. This duality is alluded to by one council member who observed: "Not many moves are made without the bishop's knowledge and clearance, but there is an attempt made by the bishop for a consensus to be reached on most actions." The duality is more pejoratively labeled by another council member who described decision making in the diocese as "participatory fascism."

Whatever particular mix of leadership styles a bishop customarily uses, a large majority of diocesan council members in addition to the bishop seem pleased with the choice. For example, on two negatively-phrased questions both bishops and council members were asked the degree to which they agreed or disagreed that 1) the bishop "exercises too much control in diocesan planning and implementation" and 2) the bishop "exercises too little responsibility and decision-making authority in diocesan planning and implementation." Over three-fourths of both bishops and council members disagreed with both statements (although less than one-third of each disagreed "strongly" with either statement). Interestingly, neither bishops' nor council members' opinions on these two evaluations of their bishop's leadership style were significantly related; apparently, bishops can individually exhibit both flaws, either one or the other, or neither.

As mentioned earlier, bishops in smaller dioceses are more likely than those in larger dioceses to feel that they at least sometimes exercise too much authority in decision-making. This opinion is echoed by council members in small dioceses who were more likely than those in larger dioceses to feel that the bishop was sometimes overcontrolling. Bishops in small dioceses may be facing a lot of apathy and find, as one bishop put it, that a more directive leadership

style on occasion is "helpful in jolting people from apathy." As already discussed, it may take some time before small dioceses really accept the leadership of the bishop they have elected, typically an "outsider." Bishops in such situations may find so many of their ideas resisted that they at least temporarily give up hope of operating by consensus and try to push through their own ideas in diocesan planning in order to institute some much needed change. Any control exercised by new bishops, particularly those who are strangers to these small dioceses, may seem to council members to be too much control.

However, the size of the diocese is not directly related to either bishops' or council members' perceptions of how most in their dioceses expect the dioceses to be run, either on the basis of consensus or the bishop's authority. Others' expectations do seem to have an effect on bishops' actions (at least it seems so to the bishops). For example, bishops who feel that most in their dioceses expect the diocese to be run on the basis of the bishop's authority are also more likely than bishops who do not share this perception to believe that they personally exercise "too much authority" in diocesan planning. In other words, they feel pressured to act against their own collegial leadership values and exert more authority than they would like to in dioceses where authoritative, directive leadership is expected of the bishop.

B. Others Expectations of How the Diocese Is To Be Governed

Diocesan council members, as well as bishops, differ in their perceptions of the degree to which their dioceses are governed by consensus in decision making, by bishop's authority, or by some mix of these two styles. A first indication that this might be the case is found in the percentage distributions of responses to how "most people in the diocese" expect it to be governed. A majority of both bishops and council members agreed (64% and 77% respectively) that most in their dioceses expected the diocese to operate on the basis of consensus. At the same time about half of the bishops and council members (47% and 52% respectively) also agreed that most of their dioceses expected it to act on the basis of the bishop's authority. While clearly more bishops and council members believe that consensus is the governance style expected by a majority in their dioceses, these percentages suggest that not all bishops and council members see expectations of consensus and bishop's authority in diocesan governance as being mutually exclusive.

Accordingly, a typology (see below) was constructed for both bishops and council members of their perceptions of the expectations of most in their diocese about how it should be governed, using each individual's answers to both questions on consensus and bishop's authority.

The first governance type, which might be called a Royal Republic (or possibly Directive Democracy?), is that in which most people in the diocese are seen to expect both that the diocese act on consensus and on bishop's authority. The second governance type, in which respondents report that most in their diocese expect it to operate on the basis of bishop's authority with little or no attempt to obtain consensus, might be aptly termed an Autocracy. In contrast, a Democracy would be a diocese in which most expect it to operate on the basis of consensus, with virtually no decision-making done on the basis of bishop's authority. It is also possible to have a diocese in which bishops and council members report that most people expect it to operate neither on the basis of consensus nor on bishop's authority; such a diocese might be classified as an Anarchy. These relationships are summed up in the chart below.

Diocesan Governance Typology

Operates on the Basis of Bishop's Authority

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neutral, Disagree</u>
<u>Operates on the Basis of Consensus</u>	<u>Agree</u> Royal Republic	<u>Neutral, Disagree</u> Democracy
	<u>Neutral, Disagree</u> Autocracy	<u>Neutral, Disagree</u> Anarchy

A minority (less than 15%) of both bishops and council members believe that their diocese is in a state of Anarchy (by the empirical definition used here). As can be seen by Table I in the appendix to this section, the largest proportion of both council members and bishops (about two-fifths of each) see their diocese as being expected to be a Democracy. The remainder, about equally divided, see their dioceses as a Royal Republic or an Autocracy.

There is some variation in how respondents perceive the expectations of governance by most in the dioceses according to when the bishop was elected (see Table II.B in Table Appendix), but more so in bishops' perceptions than in council members'. Bishops consecrated very recently (since 1980) are proportionately far more likely than those who were elected some years ago to believe that most in their diocese expect the governance to resemble an Autocracy.

In contrast, those elected quite a while ago (1972 or earlier) are most likely to believe that people in their dioceses expect it to be a Democracy. Looking at Table II.B, the expectations from most in the diocese regarding governance, as presently reported by bishops, suggest a progression when viewed according to when a bishop was elected. Within the tenure of a bishop, these data suggest most people expect the diocese to be an Autocracy at first, then more mixed in style as a Republic, then, while moving even further away from bishop's authority but not yet clearly consensus, next to Anarchy, and then finally to Democracy--possibly achieved through the bishop's efforts to bring about democracy in the diocese. But since this is suggested by cross-sectional data--and no longitudinal data is available--it is only an hypothesis about how peoples' perceptions might change in a diocese under the leadership of one bishop over the years.

Neither the size of the diocese nor how many components were present in the bishop's election are characteristics associated with the type of governance expected. Clergy's and lay leaders' expectations of the kind of governance by which the diocese will operate seems to be another variable which operates more or less independently of diocesan size and the comprehensiveness of the bishop's election process in how bishops and council members view the bishop's ministry.

Expected governance appears to have a number of different "consequences" for the perception of the bishop as a leader and the state of the diocesan leadership, decision-making and planning, generally. (Tables II.C in the Table Appendix illustrates numerically some of these possible results of governance expectations.) Bishops do not seem to be affected in how they rate themselves in performing the core episcopal tasks (scale) by what type of governance they believe most in their dioceses expect. But diocesan council members who see their dioceses as more or less in a state of Anarchy are considerably less likely than those who see other types of governance now expected in their dioceses to evaluate their bishop as effective in the core, visible episcopal tasks (scale). Apparently, they may hold the bishop responsible for the anarchial state of diocesan governance that they perceive is presently expected by most in these dioceses.

Bishops in Anarchies may, however, have some doubts about their leadership since they (like the council members) are less likely than bishops in dioceses where different types of governance are expected to believe strongly that they (the bishops) are "very faithful and effective" leaders of the diocese. On the other hand, bishops in Autocracies

are perhaps overly confident that they are "faithful and effective" leaders, as their opinion is not shared by as high a proportion of diocesan council members in Autocracies. Neither is this perception of bishops in Autocracies about their own abilities in leadership effectiveness supported by other bishops. Those bishops who described their dioceses as primarily expecting governance to resemble an Autocracy were the least likely to be nominated by other bishops as those they held in "high regard and esteem."

Although bishops in Autocracies may not be particularly admired by diocesan council members and other bishops, they are the ones least likely to report that their dioceses have "difficulty in developing common goals and setting priorities for implementing objectives." Again, diocesan council members in such dioceses appear more dubious that such difficulty is rare. Yet, it makes sense that dioceses that operate heavily on the basis of bishops' authority, the Autocracies, will have far less difficulty arriving at common goals than in dioceses where there is no clear, or perhaps shifting, source of authority and governance, the Anarchies. Indeed, both bishops and council members in Anarchies (in two-thirds majority) are in agreement that their diocese has such difficulty. Setting common goals may also be difficult in Republics, but bishops are second most likely (after those in Autocracies) to believe that such difficulty is not true of their diocese if the diocese is a Democracy. Diocesan council members are more divided in Democracies, perhaps because some see the democratic process itself as being somewhat slow and occasionally giving rise to conflict in reaching consensus on what goals should be developed and how priorities are to be set.

Diocesan council members clearly do not like Anarchies; very few (5%) agreed strongly that there is "a high morale among clergy and lay leaders and enthusiasm about the future of the diocese" in Anarchies. Bishops in Anarchies, as noted above, do not seem to be as aware of the lack of morale; in fact, type of governance appears to be generally unrelated to a bishop's perception of the state of morale in the diocese. But diocesan council members' perceptions of how most expect the diocese to be governed is indeed related to their perception of the state of morale among clergy and lay leaders in their dioceses. Although in council members' perceptions, morale is lowest in an Anarchy, it is only somewhat better in an Autocracy. More improvement in morale among clergy and lay leaders is clearly observed by council members in Democracies, but even more found that morale was quite high in a Republic, where there is a high reliance in governance both by consensus and through

bishops' authority. It seems clear that the diocesan council members, and quite probably other clergy and lay leaders in these dioceses, prefer a style of diocesan governance where they have a lot of input in making decisions and planning, but where the bishop also takes some leadership and responsibility for planning and in making some final decisions, especially those involving canon law or those on which consensus cannot be reached among the lay and clergy delegates.

These findings are in accord with the development of the episcopate in the United States where, in contrast to the Church of England, the new Church in America rejected bishops appointed by the King of England (or any other secular authority for that matter) and gave both clergy and lay members of the Church authority to elect their bishops. In a very real sense, from the birth of this nation, diocesan governance in which the authority of the bishop and the authority of clerical and lay leaders interplay in varying degrees has been characteristic of the Episcopal Church.¹¹

V. THE ROLES OF A BISHOP; WHAT A BISHOP DOES
AND HOW HE DOES IT

A. Bishops' Role Priorities: Roles Emphasized, Preferred,
Delegated

Being a bishop means being in a position that requires the incumbent to wear a number of different hats, or shoulder the responsibilities of a variety of roles. The survey sent to bishops and council members listed eighteen different roles for which bishops usually have some responsibility in the diocese. A series of questions were asked about these roles; among them were: the amount of emphasis actually placed on the role; how much should be placed on the role; whether the bishop performed the activities of the role alone, in conjunction with others, or delegated it primarily to others; how much enjoyment the bishop derived from doing the role; and whether his own expectations concerning the roles were congruent or conflicted with those held by most in his diocese.¹²

Bishops were more likely to see themselves as putting a great deal of emphasis on almost every role, and more roles in total, than were diocesan council members. Two-thirds or more of the bishops believed that they put at least "much emphasis" on seeing that 11 of the 18 listed roles were accomplished. However, an equal amount of the council members felt that the bishop put this much emphasis on seeing that 6 of the 18 roles were accomplished. The six roles that bishops feel they put the most emphasis on (and council members more or less concurred) are (in rough order by percentage of bishops saying they emphasized the role):

- 1) Parish and Mission Visitor (Chief Pastor to People)
- Highest 2) Preacher and Proclaimer of the Gospel
- ranked 3) Clergy Pastor and Counselor (Chief Pastor to the Clergy)
- 4) Chief Priest and Liturgical Officer (Administrator of Sacraments)

- 5) Spiritual Standard Setter, Exemplar of the Faith
- 6) Promoter of Missionary Outreach

In contrast, the five roles which at least 45% of the bishops said they gave only "some" to "little" emphasis on seeing that they were done and no more than about one-fifth said they put a "great deal" of emphasis on seeing that they were done (in continuing order of priority) are:

- 14) Teacher
- Lowest 15) Stirrer of the Conscience of people on social
ranked behavior or public policy (prophetic ministry)
- 16) Theologian
- 17) Clergy Arbiter and Judge
- 18) Fund Raiser for the diocese

At least one-fourth of the bishops felt that they put a "great deal of emphasis" on each of the remaining roles, and 40% or less said that they placed only "some" to "little" emphasis on each of them. These roles are listed roughly in the order of emphasis by bishops, from 7 to 13): Evangelist and Advocate of Church Growth, Preserver of Episcopal Traditions and Practices (Guardian of the Faith), Chief Deployment Officer, Reconciler and Conflict Manager between laity and clergy and among clergy, Enabler and Supporter of Experimentation and Innovation, Administrator of the Diocese, Unifier of Episcopalians of different theological perspectives. With the exception of the lowest ranking six, it should be reiterated that a clear majority put at least "much emphasis" on most of the listed roles. Even one of the lowest ranking roles ("Teacher") drew 55% of the bishops saying that they gave at least "much" emphasis to seeing that it was accomplished in the diocese. In contrast, council members not only believed that this was a low ranked role in terms of emphasis, but that it was given far less emphasis than believed by bishops in that only 35% of the council members felt the bishop gave it at least "much" emphasis. One very good reason for this discrepancy is that "Teacher" is one of the roles most likely to be delegated completely to others in the diocese, although most bishops are involved with related activities. Council members may not understand (or believe) that the bishop is really putting much emphasis on the role unless they see him doing it directly.

Although it is certainly possible for a bishop to put a great deal of emphasis on seeing that a particular episcopal role is carried out well in the diocese and not actually do the role all by himself or even at all himself, correlations indicate that in actuality (as council members may suspect) bishops who put a great deal of emphasis on a particular role are more likely to do that role themselves and very unlikely to delegate it completely to others. (At the same time it is also true that a great majority of bishops delegate in part the activities of all listed roles to others as well as doing it themselves.) The role that bishops put the least emphasis on doing is also the role most likely to be delegated completely to others--that of "Fund Raiser for the Diocese." Only 2% of the bishops fill this role mainly themselves, 57% share the activities of this role with others in their diocese, and 41% delegate the role Fund Raiser to others. The role that receives the most emphasis from bishops--being a "Parish and Mission Visitor (Chief Pastor to People)"--is also the role they are most likely to do (mainly or completely) by themselves (39%) and the role they are very, very unlikely to delegate mainly to others (1%), leaving three-fifths (60%) who share the activities of this role with others in their dioceses.

There are only five roles that as many as one-fifth (and no more than two-fifths) of the bishops say are "mostly" done by themselves alone. These roles (in order by percentages of bishops saying they did this mainly alone) are:

Parish and Mission Visitor (Chief Pastor to People)
 Chief Priest and Liturgical Officer
 Preacher and Proclaimer of the Gospel
 Spiritual Standard Setter, Exemplar of the Faith
 Preserver of Episcopal Traditions and Practices
 (Guardian of the Faith)

There are nine roles that at least one-fifth (to nearly three-fifths) of the council members believe bishops should do primarily by themselves. While these nine include the five roles listed above which about one-fifth of the bishops say they do fill mainly by themselves, the five top roles selected by the council members somewhat differ from those chosen by the bishops. These are (in rough order of the tasks that diocesan council members feel the bishops should do mainly alone):

Clergy Pastor and Counselor (Chief Pastor to the Clergy)
 Parish and Mission Visitor (Chief Pastor to the People)

Chief Priest and Liturgical Officer
 Clergy Arbiter and Judge
 Spiritual Standard Setter, Exemplar of the Faith

The bishops' delegating of most of these roles at least partly to others in the diocese is consonant with the afore-discussed emphasis which the great majority of bishops place on using a "collegial" leadership style with the delegation of authority and responsibility for core diocesan tasks. It appears, however, that there are some roles that at least a substantial minority of the council members feel should not be delegated; being a pastor and, when necessary, a judge to clergy and congregations are among these. The smaller the diocese, the more likely council members were to feel that the bishop himself should remain responsible for pastoral roles.

Fortunately, the roles that council members felt were most important for bishops to emphasize and do at least partly themselves were those also enjoyed by bishops. For example, a majority of bishops (64%) selected "Parish and Mission Visitor (Chief Pastor to People)" as one of the four roles they enjoyed the most. Second highest (51%) in percentage was "Clergy Pastor and Counselor (Chief Pastor to the Clergy)." The following roles were also selected by at least one-fourth of the bishops as ones they particularly enjoy: "Promoter of Missionary Outreach," "Chief Pastor and Liturgical Officer," and "Spiritual Standard Setter." In contrast, the roles the bishops disliked the most (or enjoyed the least) were "Fund Raiser for the diocese," and "Clergy Arbiter and Judge," three-fourths or more of the bishops saying these roles were two of the four they least enjoyed. (Avoiding the role of Fund Raiser for the diocese may seem fairly easy and, as noted, most bishops do delegate out this role; however, it is much more difficult, if not impossible, for bishops to do the same with the role of Clergy Arbiter and Judge, as this role, while perhaps one of the most unpleasant for a number of bishops, is "part of the territory.") The next most disliked roles in terms of bishops' selection were "Reconciler and Conflict Manager between laity and clergy and among clergy" and "Administrator, Manager of the Diocese," 56% and 41% respectively selecting these as one of the four roles they least enjoyed.

It is interesting that for each of the eighteen roles listed on the survey, there was at least one bishop and usually several who described the role as one of the four most enjoyable and at least one bishop who described the identical role as one of the four most disliked. Comments made on the questionnaire about why a bishop did or did

not enjoy a particular role indicate both personal preferences and abilities as well as bishops' varying experiences in acting in the different roles, as illustrated in the following comment by a bishop:

"Handling anger is a problem for me, so Conflict Management is a strain. While I do enjoy being Chief Priest, Preserver of Traditions, Preacher and Teacher, clergy often resist and resent me in these roles."

The greatest divergence as to whether a role was most or least enjoyed occurred on the role of "Stirrer of the conscience of people on social behavior or public policy" (prophetic ministry) where 24% said it was the role they most enjoyed and 20% said it was one of their four least enjoyed roles. More discussion will be given to this role and how those bishops interviewed handled it later in this report.

The bishops' enjoyment of a particular role is certainly not enhanced in the long run if he wishes to interpret it one way and others in his diocese want him to interpret it another way, or if he would place more or less emphasis on the role than others are pressuring him to do. About two-fifths (37%) of the bishops said that there were expectations which most people in their dioceses held regarding the bishops' roles which were in conflict with their own preferred concepts of these roles. These bishops who experience some role conflict (considerably fewer bishops than a decade ago) are more inclined than bishops who report no conflict to feel that they are less effective in the core episcopal tasks (scale)--particularly in mediating conflicts in congregations; administering the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Church; increasing efficiency in the management of the diocese, and giving personal and spiritual counseling.

Bishops were asked to specify which (if any) roles people in their dioceses wanted them to: a) give more time and attention to than bishops preferred, and b) give less time and emphasis to than they wished. Although every role was listed by at least one bishop as one their dioceses wanted them to give more time and attention to than they deemed necessary, the two roles most highly nominated by bishops in this regard were being a Fund Raiser (16%) and being a Conflict Manager (10%). Or, from another vantage point, there was no role in which as much as one-fourth of the bishops felt overpressured by their dioceses to do or not do. The role which received the highest proportion of bishops saying that they wanted to give it more (23%) time and attention than most in their dioceses wanted them

to was being a "Stirrer of the Conscience of people on social behavior or public policy (prophetic ministry)"; and (as in the case of bishops' reported enjoyment of this role) a few (8%) said they were pressured to put more time and emphasis into this role than they wanted or felt comfortable doing. Clearly this is a role on which it is fairly easy for bishops and dioceses to be mismatched in terms of expectations and episcopal preferences.

This role of the bishop as Prophet or Stirrer of the Conscience of people was deemed among the roles of particular interest that were explored further in interviews with bishops.

B. Particular Episcopal Roles Explored in Interviews with Bishops

1. Bishop as Prophet: or Stirrer of the Conscience of People on Social Behavior and Public Policy

It should be reiterated that this is the role that receives the most divided response from bishops as to whether most people in their dioceses want them to act differently in the role (typically put more or less time into it) than they preferred to, as well as most mixed regarding whether bishops felt it was one of their four most enjoyed or least enjoyed. Perhaps in part because of these divisions, the prophetic role was one of the three least emphasized roles by bishops, overall, although still over half gave it at least "much" time and emphasis. It was also the role most likely to be shared by the bishop with others in his diocese, 89% of the bishops saying they performed the activities connected with the role along with others.

Bishops who report putting a greater emphasis on being a Prophet differ from those bishops who do not put much emphasis on this role in a number of ways. First, those bishops who put more emphasis on the role of Prophet feel more skilled in "making public statements on how the faith relates to moral, social, community, national or international issues." These "prophetic" bishops are also more likely to see themselves as effective in dealing with public media reporters, as well as in initiating and maintaining relations with judicatory executives and clergy of other denominations and religions than those bishops who put some or little emphasis on the prophetic role. The "prophetic" bishops are more likely to consider themselves theologically liberal than bishops less inclined to engage in this role, and are also more likely to have a higher proportion of their congregations in urban areas. This last finding makes sense in that it is in urban areas where social problems

more frequently become prominent, and there is a greater possibility of judicatory executives of different denominations forming coalitions of concern to address such issues. In more urbanized areas, there are also a higher number of public media reporters and interviewers.

Overall, 37% of the bishops felt that they could use some help in dealing with the media and making statements to the press. The ability to present one's opinions in a way that both makes 'good press' and is not overly distorted by reporters is part of knowing how to be a good Prophet. A couple of bishops (among others) cited their lack of confidence in their abilities to be a good Prophet and to deal with issues in front of reporters (or at all) as a reason for not having done so--though one who took the risk was pleasantly surprised:

"Only a small group in this diocese want me to speak out and act on social issues. I do very little of this--mostly because I mistrust my competence."

"I am pressured to speak out as a prophet by people in this diocese, which I find uncomfortable. But on an issue involved with racial justice I did speak out--and was amazed that people respected what I said!"

While bishops may act in the Prophet role and perhaps even effectively get people involved in both looking at and acting on social issues from a Christian perspective, without media attention some of the impact is lost. It is important that a constituency know what the bishop--or, more broadly, Episcopal bishops as a group--are doing or thinking about social issues. One diocesan council member comments:

"Please use the television media more to enhance the visibility of bishops gathering amongst themselves and working hard (as they do) to promote social justice, peace and resolving conflicts within relationships to other denominations. Even people in our diocese are not aware of how much work our bishop does in this area."

Whether or not the majority of clergy and lay leaders in the dioceses supported their bishop's activities in the role of Prophet often greatly depended upon what social issue(s) the bishop chose to address. Several bishops indicated that it was very much the particular issue which determined whether their dioceses supported them in the role of Prophet; in addition, several other bishops indicated that their dioceses were sometimes divided about which

issues their bishop should try to stir the conscience of people. For example:

"The diocese expects me to speak out on unemployment, the poor, and peace. The diocese is supportive of my taking positions on social issues. But the reverse is the case with sexuality issues--the diocese is conservative and does not want me to speak from a liberal point of view about issues such as abortion and homosexuality."

"The diocese does expect the bishop's active and visible leadership on world hunger and aid to starving people, but not on peace and justice issues. The vast majority of laity in this diocese want the bishop to be uninvolved in social issues. WCC and NCC are considered anathema."

"In this diocese there is pressure on both sides for me to speak out or to hold my tongue, but there is stronger pressure for me to speak out. I welcome this usually--but at times I would rather not be involved. I try to decide carefully and judiciously what I am going to speak about."

There are some dioceses in which bishops report that their being a Prophet--speaking out on any social, moral or world issue--is disapproved of; not that this disapproval necessarily stops them from making statements, but it does make them more cautious:

"Pressure if any in the diocese on me is to shut up and not say anything. When I do speak out--there is always some flak. There is little agreement in the diocese on social and peace issues. The best way to handle it, I feel, is to be careful and responsible in making occasional statements, rather than spouting off all the time on everything. When possible, I speak in conjunction with other judicatory leaders ecumenically, rather than alone."

"I have a liberal reputation and previously had the experience of losing income from congregations when I spoke out on the Vietnam War. Although I was supported by a large number of clergy, I was shaken by the lack of congregational support. I was much happier being a social activist as a parish priest."

Happily, a number of bishops have reached an understanding of sorts with their dioceses that they will speak out on

issues, and most in the diocese have come to support the bishop's right to speak out, even though they may not agree with him:

"We do much work in this diocese on hunger and peace, and I have participated in seminars on racial justice. I have also opposed capital punishment. I received much opposition at first, and the diocese still isn't always affirming, but now they know where I stand and they expect me to speak out."

"I was elected as someone who was known as a social activist; and after over a decade as bishop, people have come to know what to expect from me here. They like me as a person, respect my integrity, and approve of my activism--even though they often disagree with what I say."

"Prayer and justice are absolutely related. The diocese expects me to make careful pronouncements and even more, to take action. This is true even when people do not always agree with what the bishop does or says. I usually do so though not in isolation, but with other groups of Christians."

2. Being the Chief Pastor to the People (Parish and Mission Visitor) Versus Being Administrator of the Diocese

This potential between being the Parish and Mission Visitor and the Diocesan Administrator is perhaps noticed more by lay leaders in the dioceses than by clergy, especially bishops. Normally, lay leaders would like the bishop to delegate all or almost all administration to others in the diocese and act as Chief Pastor to the People, spending as much time as possible visiting congregations and perhaps also counseling clergy. The following comments from diocesan council members are fairly typical:

"Allow the bishop to have more of a role as Chief Pastor; administration can and should be delegated."

"Free the bishops from administrative work when they do not have the time nor training--nor should they have to do it. Use qualified lay people to carry most administrative work."

"I believe the whole structure needs change. The bishop should be only the things a bishop can be and nothing else. A big business needs top notch executives, not somebody who was called to preach."

I've not talked to any burning bushes, but I believe that God must be pretty sick and tired of the Church's business being run by non-professionals using Elizabethian Rules."

Priests also would like the bishop to spend more time being Chief Pastor to them than in doing administration and program development; for example:

"After twenty years as a priest....I have concluded that being a bishop in the Episcopal Church in the twentieth century is an absolutely impossible task to fulfill well by one's own efforts, and training is only modestly helpful....It is my impression that the work of the bishops would be more productive if they devoted more time to being Chief Pastor to Clergy, as opposed to the amount of time which I observe them spending with programmatic issues. Programs and administration can be delegated, but pastoral relationships cannot be; and a lot of priests would be far more productive if they had a pastoral relationship with their bishop."

Actually, this tension between being an Administrator and being Chief Pastor to People and Congregations was, in particular, a major concern of the bishops nearly a decade ago. The earlier study found that many bishops were dubious as to whether people in their dioceses appreciated the amount of time they had to spend in administration. Nearly one-third of the bishops ten years ago said that they experienced some conflict regarding how much time they wanted (or had) to spend in administration and how much most in their dioceses expected them to spend (which was little in relation to the amount of time people felt they should spend in being Chief Pastor to the People, that is, in visiting congregations).

In the current study, however, only 5% of the bishops report conflict between themselves and most in their dioceses about how much time they should spend in being Administrator of the Diocese. Possibly the earlier study--which detailed some of the misunderstanding about this role--has helped in this regard, as well as the improved climate overall in which bishops now seem to be conducting their episcopal ministries compared to ten years ago. While presently there may not be as much overt conflict about the bishops' handling of their administrative tasks, the council members' quotes given above indicate that some of the same feelings are still present. This is also attested to by the fact that 80% of the bishops in 1984 said it was at least "somewhat true" of them in the last year that they "felt the need

for help in doing my administrative work." As was also the case ten years ago, those bishops in 1984 who most strongly felt this need were likely to be in the smaller dioceses, particularly those with few staff. Bishops in the small dioceses also are less likely to have the services of retired bishops and, of course, suffragan or assistant bishops to help them in their role of Chief Pastor to the People. Thus, bishops in small dioceses probably put less emphasis than those in large dioceses on fulfilling the role of Chief Pastor to the People because they are more apt than those in larger, richer dioceses to have to do many of the roles totally or primarily by themselves; hence, they cannot put a great deal of emphasis really on any single role.

Bishops view the role of Administrator quite differently, but this variation is only in part based on how much help they receive in doing the activities connected with this role. Some like administration; some hate it. Some feel that good administration is the essence of the episcopal leadership task; others believe that administration conflicts with and diminishes episcopal ministry. The following comments from bishops on this role reflect their varying perspectives:

"I feel a polarity between the institutional demands and the Gospel demands."

"Administration takes half my time. I do all I can. I love it!"

"I have real trouble with administration. I am working on development of skills in learning how to and what to delegate. I instinctively hate paperwork and feel guilty about delegating such a dirty job."

"I really enjoy administration and find other roles suffer because of my commitment to be an administrator."

"I see administration as a pastoral instrument. Bad administration is lousy pastoring."

As the last comment suggests, some bishops see no conflict between their administrative and pastoral roles because they see them as intertwined, administration often for them serving as a means of being both a pastor and an enabling leader of others' ministries. This connection is further illustrated in the following quotes from bishops who have a holistic understanding of Chief Pastor as being primarily pastor to a system rather than primarily to individuals.

"Because visitations are more than a day, correspondence piles up, causing me some stress. However, I see this administration as pastoral. For instance, after each visitation, I write the rector and the warden, addressing questions raised and giving pastoral and spiritual support."

"I do administration broadly. I see it as one of the gifts of the Spirit, as allowing the body of Christ to function freely in prayer and mission. I delegate much authority to others using a collegial style. I try to keep a hand in all administration without undue interference."

Bishops who put a lot of emphasis on being Administrator of the Diocese are neither more nor less likely as a group to put a lot of emphasis on being Chief Pastor to Congregations. In other words, being heavily involved in seeing that the administration of the dioceses is carried out does not necessarily mean that the bishop will put less emphasis on visiting congregations.

3. Being the Judge of and Pastor to Clergy

Bishops who put a lot of emphasis on being Chief Pastor to Clergy also put a great deal of emphasis on being Clergy Arbiter and Judge. Overall, however, bishops are far more likely to put substantial emphasis on being the priests' pastor than their judge, 47% of the bishops saying that they put a "great deal of emphasis" on being a Pastor compared to only 18% saying that they put this much emphasis on being a Judge. One of the reasons that bishops who strongly emphasize one role also tend to emphasize the other role is because although the two roles can conflict (and do for some bishops, as will be described), these roles can also be compatible. Being a good Pastor to Clergy may sometimes involve being a judge of their performance and potential. Conversely, being a good Clergy Arbiter and Judge will involve some pastoral work with clergy. It is the manner in which the two roles are handled in relationship to each other which seems critical.

Interviewed bishops noted that the major difficulty is in trying to be concurrently both a pastor and a judge to the same priest. Although one bishop believes that the two roles combine well together, "The pastor keeps the judge from being cold and the judge keeps the pastor from being mushy." most bishops believe that in cases of conflict between rector and congregation or in making recommendations to search committees about a priest with

personal problems, acting equally in both roles is nearly impossible to do, or do well, or do with integrity.

Some bishops are sufficiently apprehensive about potential conflict between their roles as Judge and Pastor to Clergy that they give up a personal in-depth pastoral role with clergy altogether, or at least want to, because:

"I don't think a bishop can be a good pastor to his clergy--you have too much of their future in your hands."

Bishops with this orientation generally do talk with the priests enough to recommend them to someone else in the diocese for in-depth pastoral counseling or other help. Much as they might like to, bishops (at least if they are diocesan) cannot totally give over the role of clergy judge to others; but because bishops do have this power of judgement over clergy, it might be very difficult for some clergy (as several bishops confirmed) to trust the bishop enough to confide negative information about themselves, that is, to confide freely in the bishop. The bishop quoted below makes that point as well as noting that aside from the possibility of clergy apprehensiveness and defensiveness, clergy may ask for far more time from the bishop for pastoral counseling than he could possibly have the hours or energy to give with all his other episcopal duties.

"The primary problem with some clergy who want their bishop to be a good pastor to them is that they won't let him, either by refusing to admit they have a problem (even when painfully obvious!), or by placing unreasonable and unobtainable demands on the bishop."

Some bishops do become deeply involved in being pastors to their clergy--as long as they do not have to be a judge to these same clergy. Should the bishop be asked to decide whether a particular priest was fit for the parish job he or she occupied or appropriate for another opening, the bishop would presumably delegate any counseling needed by the priest to another. For example, the following bishop comments:

"Role conflict is a problem for me because I want to be a pastor, but I can't always be one. When I have to play the role of judge, I make sure a pastor is available to the priest."

One of the conflicts between Judge and Pastor most personally difficult for the bishop seems to be cases of

marital difficulties and divorce among parochial clergy. This is because there are at least three parties involved in the conflict--the two members of the couple and the congregation, as illustrated in the bishops' comments:

"I have faced growing sensitivity to the duality between judge and pastor in cases of divorce in a clergy family, which involves the priest, the spouse, and the congregation."

"Broken clergy marriages are the worst problem for me--especially for the bishop's role as Judge-Pastor. I simply cannot be the chief pastor in these situations--but I am a pastor up to a certain point and then refer. The authority figure image causes problems with the pastoral role."

Some bishops (and perhaps even a majority) combine the roles of Judge and Pastor. However, they generally give a little more weight to being the Judge because while they may not be the only possible clergy Arbiter and Judge in the diocese, as one bishop put it, they are usually "the last court." The following are examples of how bishops handled their role of what might be termed "Pastoral Judge," with varying degrees of success:

"I seek to be firmly honest, but never set the fellow down and say, 'you've got to shape up.' I've won some and lost some. In one case where I asked a priest to keep being preoccupied with getting a call elsewhere, the man later expressed appreciation. In another case a warden-rector conflict situation, though I believed I was on both sides, the rector was convinced I was on the warden's side."

"I had a case with clerical dishonesty--a priest who claimed a doctorate that was not received. I was torn between trying to right the deception and compassion for the individual, who had great vanity. I decided not to humiliate him publicly. Later, I heard I was perceived by this same priest as being too lenient and permissive."

"So far I have been handling the balance between being Clergy Judge and Pastor pretty well. A recent example was the suspension of a priest on a morals charge. My basic style is to make space so the individual can take personal responsibility for the behavior and not initially act as a judge myself. After the facts have been gathered, I do ultimately

have to act as judge. This priest was directed to therapy and asked to stay in touch. But unfortunately, the relationship became conflicted, the individual left the diocese, and has been reluctant to accept further help."

"I am required to make tough personal and administrative decisions. Pastorally, I am very sensitive. I set up possibilities for clergy to meet with others, including retired bishops, other clergy or lay counselors, consultants and career development resource persons. I find a conflict within myself in having to counsel a priest and then recommend him for other positions. In one instance, there was a priest who had several sexual liaisons with different women. I could not recommend him elsewhere. Also, I have felt the same about not recommending priests crippled by fatigue and burn-out."

"If I am going to be effective pastorally, I must make certain judgments/decisions, but even so the person with whom I am working usually comes away feeling pretty good about the judgment. One priest recently had to leave his parish; I directed him to counseling, and he stays in touch."

Most bishops indicated that when they have to discipline priests, they try to do it pastorally and direct the priest to a source of counseling. One bishop remarked:

"My judgments are intended to be pastorally supportive, even when unpleasant such as in an involuntary termination of a pastoral relationship."

In summary, the Judge role of the bishop may give the Pastor of Clergy role greater import in getting clergy to follow the bishop's suggestions. However, it also may interfere with clergy being open enough with the bishop about their personal feelings and difficulties to get as much counseling help as they need. Therefore, bishops find it most effective to be pastorally supportive in directing the priest in need of counseling of various sorts, but not do counseling of any depth or duration with the priest personally.

4. Preacher

The focus of the question about the bishop's role as Preacher in the interviews was the extent to which their preaching had changed since they became bishops. Over four-fifths of the bishops interviewed believed that their preaching had changed since they were priests, mainly for

the better, some for the worse, but almost all in terms of subject matter and style. Nearly one-half of these bishops said that the major change in their preaching was that now it seldom could be related to the concerns of people in particular congregations. This is primarily because the bishops were not sufficiently familiar with either the people in the pews or the lively issues of the church or community to be able to use them as illustrations or sermon points. Secondly, very often the bishops' visits to parishes are centered around events such as baptisms and confirmations, which demand or at least suggest sermons focused on the events themselves or on the lectionary. Even if the bishops could get around these obstacles to preaching sermons more similar to the ones they used in the parish ministry, they no longer have the possibility of sermon continuity from Sunday to Sunday on a theme or set of interrelated themes (a practice of serial sermonizing some indicated they had enjoyed as rectors). On the other hand, some said they spent less preparation time than they had as rectors because the same sermons could be used (perhaps with minor alterations) several times. Some bishops felt so constrained by the new parameters on their preaching that they believed it had suffered in quality; others who noted many of the same factors felt their preaching had improved. Those most likely to cite improvement explained that not having to preach on matters of interest to a local congregation or even be as tied to a local congregation allowed them the freedom to preach on larger global themes and do it more effectively than they could have done as parish ministers. The following quotations illustrate some of these points:

"My style has changed from a disciplined, written sermon to a extemporaneous sermon style. Content is different; there can be no continuity. A bishop needs to be more conscious of the need to express the 'global character of the church'. My first year preaching as a bishop was tough--because of lack of knowledge of the context and the people. But this gets better and easier each year."

"It is hard to preach to those you don't know. I can't speak to where they are--unless it is on national issues. I can't give a series to teach new things because I am only in a parish a short time periodically. So sermons must be on universal truths."

"Most noticeable change to me has been the necessity of preaching in the baptism/confirmation context. There is no chance of a developmental context for

the preaching since I am in a different parish each week. This tends to erode good preaching habits."

"I feel it harder to preach now as a bishop because I lack a close pastoral relationship with a congregation. I confess that I find myself succumbing to the temptation to repeat myself, use old sermons. I don't prepare as well, and my preaching has suffered."

"My preaching style has changed since I have been bishop. I wing it much more. I work hard in preparation, but preach intuitively, spontaneously with greater flexibility. I feel the pull of global issues in preaching. I am a far better preacher than I was as a priest, both my content and style are better. I enjoy preaching now more than ever."

5. Gatekeeper to the Ordained Ministry

One role inadvertently left out of the survey list of bishops' roles is Gatekeeper to the Ordained Ministry. However, in interviews bishops were explicitly asked how much emphasis and time they gave to being the "Gatekeeper to the Ordained Ministry, or your job in screening persons who wish to be sponsored by the diocese in going to seminary and/or want to be considered as postulants and candidates for Holy Orders," whether this was a role they enjoyed, and what reward and/or frustrations they experienced in the last couple of years.

All sixty-one bishops interviewed deemed the Gatekeeper role to be one of their most important responsibilities, although there were differences among bishops in the extent to which they personally tried to undertake all the activities involved in this role and the degree to which they enjoyed it. Although diocesans, not surprisingly, were more likely to give substantial time to this role than suffragans, several suffragans or assistant bishops interviewed were put in charge of part of the ordination process for priesthood, or more typically, given major responsibility for training and ordination of nonstipendiary clergy (that is, permanent deacons and 'Canon Eights').

The more postulants and candidates there are for the ordained ministry, the more time bishops potentially might have to spend in being Gatekeepers. Bishops in the larger dioceses sometimes complained in interviews that while they might ordain only seven or eight people a year, they had anywhere from thirty to one-hundred-and-thirty people "in the pipeline" for ordination to whom some attention

had to be paid. In contrast, it seems that the smaller dioceses had proportionately fewer in the ordination pipeline, normally under ten in any given year. Yet neither the size of the diocese nor the number of people headed toward ordination were the sole determining factors of how much time diocesan bishops personally gave to the role of Gatekeeper. Of equal or greater importance seemed to be how much time individual bishops wanted to give to personally interviewing and counseling persons who felt they were called to the ordained ministry. Another factor in how much time the bishops devoted to being Gatekeeper was the degree of success they had in setting up processes which enabled the Standing Committee, Commission on Ministry, BACAM and diocesan staff to do some or all of the preliminary work and counseling before the bishop became involved. Important and, for some, enjoyable as the role of Gatekeeper may be, if too much time is given to it by the bishop compared to his other responsibilities, he may find the sheer time demands a source of frustration. The following comments from bishops illustrate some of these points:

"I get personally involved with the role. I spend 20-25% of my time conferring with prospective ordinands. I have thirty to forty people as postulants or candidates now. I enjoy this role, but I get impatient when it takes so much time."

"This is my largest expenditure of time. I spend most time in interviewing, explaining the process, testing the sense of vocation. I feel the bishop must be accessible for aspirants and try to see that I am."

"I enjoyed the role of encouraging vocations as a priest, but when I was elected bishop, I found it a burden, as there were 120 postulants and candidates. My predecessor would accept anyone, and the process was fairly loose. Now that I have strengthened the roles of the Commission on Ministry and Standing Committee and let them carry more of the burden for screening, I am enjoying the role more."

"My role as Gatekeeper is not a hard one. I have a strong COM and have strengthened the local parish in screening. I do not see anyone that the COM and Standing Committee have not passed on and until after the individual has gone through a formation year."

Getting other groups and individuals to do part of the screening process (at least for ordination) not only saves the bishop a lot of time but also a good bit of what is generally considered by bishops the most unpleasant part of the Gatekeeper role--sometimes having to say "no" to those the bishops feel are unsuitable for the ordained ministry. Apart from dealing with pain inflicted on the person turned down, several bishops expressed frustration in not knowing, as one put it, how to say an "affirmative no"--or how to encourage the person turned down for the ordained ministry to put his or her energies into ministries not requiring ordination. The following quotes from bishops illustrate and extend these points:

"I give much time and emphasis to the Gatekeeper role. So many feel called to ordained ministry, and we cannot and should not accept all. I am glad to have the COM and the Standing Committee share in the selection process. The hardest and most painful thing is to turn down an applicant for postulancy."

"One of the big problems we face is bishops who will ordain anybody. I won't. I believe God calls to ministry--calls all persons to ministry, and it is the job of the Church to say what kind of ministry it is to be."

"I interview each aspirant before the formal process begins and try to guide people to the best use of vocation--which might not be ordination. I enjoy the role very much, but as we are a small diocese, we have relatively few postulants. The rewards are seeing a true vocation blossom; the frustrations are those few cases where there was no vocation, and the Commission on Ministry was reluctant to act."

"This role of Gatekeeper takes much more time than I ever imagined because the responsibility is awesome and it is one of the hardest things I do. It is not a role I particularly enjoy. The rewards are seeing enthusiasm and observing Christians turned on by their faith. Frustrations come over whether the call is to ordination or to another form of ministry."

A few bishops indicated that one frustration of the Gatekeeper role was arriving at a consensual decision in the diocese, especially within and between the Commission on Ministry and Standing Committee, as to what criteria should be used

in approving or turning down someone for ordination; for example:

"I put a great deal of time and energy into the Gatekeeper area. I meet monthly with the COM, and this is a very high priority item. While there are certainly rewards in this role, a frustration for me and others is the lack of a clear definition of what screens a person in or out. Everyone seems to be an individual case."

A secondary or additional frustration in being the Gatekeeper mentioned by a few bishops is an oversupply already (at least in some dioceses) of ordained clergy for full-time, paid parish positions.¹⁴ As one bishop expressed it: "Though I enjoy the role of Gatekeeper...there is frustration presently in trying to be encouraging, while not creating problems for those who will not find employment in the church."

VI. ADMIRED CHARACTERISTICS OF BISHOPS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF BISHOPS WHO ARE EFFECTIVE AND ADMIRED

A. Admired Characteristics of Bishops

As in the earlier study, bishops in 1984 were asked to name "four bishops whom you hold in high regard and esteem," and to "explain why you admire the particular bishop." Of the approximately 125 different bishops who were named, about 45 of them are not presently in dioceses (being either on the national staff, executives in other organizations, retired, or deceased). The qualities most often cited by bishops as the reason behind their selection of highly-regarded bishops (in rough order of importance for the majority) are: being pastoral; being spiritual and developing this quality in others; having leadership skills in administration; being decisive and courageous; having high integrity and sincerity; being stable and easy to work with; being an advocate for social concerns; being creative and innovative; being intelligent and wise; and being dedicated, hard-working and dependable.

Apparently, a large number of bishops are deemed by their brothers to have one or more of these qualities in very strong measure. Over 60% of the bishops were nominated by another bishop presently serving in a diocese as being one held in high regard and esteem. No bishop received more than twenty-one nominations from other bishops. It is this dispersion, rather than the possible clustering of nominations around a handful of bishops, that is the most striking.

Correlations indicate that those bishops who received more nominations (that is, at least two) are more likely to have been a bishop for a longer time and to be in a wealthier diocese than those who received one or none. Both the length of time one has been a bishop and the wealth of the diocese may be factors that increase a bishop's visibility to his peers which is presumably of some importance in receiving nominations. However, correlations also indicate that certain actions a bishop takes in his diocese may be particularly likely to elicit the admiration of other

bishops. The more emphasis bishops place on being the "Unifier of Episcopalians of Different Theological Positions" and on being the "Reconciler and Conflict Manager between laity and clergy and among clergy," the more votes of esteem/admiration they received from other bishops. This was also true to some extent for bishops who put a great deal of emphasis on being the "Spiritual Standard Setter, Exemplar of the Faith" in their dioceses.

Not surprisingly, the more highly nominated bishops also report receiving greater amounts of personal and professional support from other bishops and judicatory executives. However, as indicated, they are more likely to experience some role conflict between their own preferred emphasis and interpretation of an episcopal role and that held by others in their dioceses. The bishops more frequently nominated by their peers are unlikely to feel lonely or isolated, or in need of early retirement. Bishops who perceive themselves as effective in the core episcopal tasks (scale) are neither more nor less likely to be nominated by their peers. This does not necessarily mean that bishops' self-evaluations are incorrect, but simply that the good things they are doing in their dioceses are not known to other bishops. Diocesan council members were asked to indicate how important each of a list of qualities or abilities was for a bishop ideally to possess. Clearly, the most important was for the bishop to have "an inner quality of spiritual wholeness and depth," almost all (98%) of the council members saying that it was at least "quite important" for a bishop and 71% saying it was "very important." The next most important attributes in the opinion of a majority of council members (over 90% saying each particular attribute was at least "quite important") were being

devout in practice;
 an inspiration to others' faith development;
 warm and caring;
 a good listener, easy to talk to;
 a strong leader;
 able to manage, delegate, and coordinate the work of the diocese.

Although the ten remaining attributes listed were at least "quite important" to a two-fifths minority or even a majority of council members, the lowest ranking abilities were being a "good writer" (54% felt that this was at best only somewhat important for a bishop to have in his skill repertoire), and "savy in dealing with radio, TV, newspaper reporters, talk-show hosts, journalists, etc." (59% saying that this was at best only somewhat important for a bishop to be able to do well). This last percentage of council members

are likely to be in dioceses which either do not as a whole favor the bishop taking a prophetic role or object to the positions he has already taken. Even if it is important to some extent, the ability to deal with the public media certainly is not as essential to lay and clergy leaders in these dioceses as the other characteristics. Laity put more importance on the bishops' being savvy in dealing with public media reporters than did clergy, as well as putting more importance on bishops ideally having experience in conflict management and in dealing with groups.

A majority of the council members found the remaining qualities of a bishop at least quite important: having a sense of humor; being a good teacher; being a good speaker; having expertise in dealing with groups and in conflict management; having diplomatic and political skills; and having theological expertise.

B. Bishops Effectiveness in Doing their Ministries in the Diocese

Bishops were asked to evaluate themselves, and diocesan council members were asked to evaluate their diocesan bishops, on seventeen role/task activities that most bishops engage in or have major responsibility for seeing are accomplished--in terms of whether they (the bishop) are "very effective," "somewhat effective," "mixed, both effective and ineffective," "somewhat ineffective," "very ineffective." The area in which the bishops are rated most effective both by themselves and by council members is parish and mission visitations; this is fortunate considering its importance to lay and clergy as a role. Almost all bishops (97%) and four-fifths (80%) of the diocesan council members thought they (their bishops) were at least somewhat effective in doing parish visitations, and 60% of the bishops and 54% of the council members said they (their bishops) were "very effective" in this.

There was also general agreement between the majority of bishops and the majority of council members about bishops' abilities in "administering the doctrine, discipline and worship of the church according to diocesan and national canons," about four-fifths of both council members and bishops seeing their bishops (themselves) as at least somewhat effective in this. Yet while 46% of the council members felt their bishops were "very effective," only 19% of the bishops gave this high a self-evaluation.

There was one role activity that a majority of bishops felt they were more effective in doing than they were given

credit for by a majority of council members. In the area of "Building and maintaining morale among clergy and lay leaders, and their enthusiasm for the future of the diocese," while 86% of the bishops felt they were at least "somewhat effective" here (and only 3% saw themselves as even "somewhat ineffective"), only 49% of the diocesan council members saw their bishops as at least "somewhat effective" and nearly one-fourth (24%) said they believed that their bishops were at least "somewhat ineffective in this area."

The single area in which the largest proportion of bishops and council members felt they (their bishops) were probably the least effective was "starting new churches," with around one-third of both bishops (32%) and council members (35%) saying they (their bishops) were at least somewhat ineffective here.

Overall, bishops were more likely to rate themselves as effective than council members were them on these tasks of the episcopate. For example, for the seventeen listed activities, 60% or more of the bishops rated themselves as at least "somewhat effective" on twelve compared to only six activities on which that high a proportion of council members rated their bishop as effective. Among the council members, laity were significantly more likely than the clergy to rate the bishop higher on fourteen of the seventeen items. In other words, the major reason council members' ratings of the bishops' effectiveness in these task areas often are slightly to considerably lower than those of the bishops themselves is because of the more negative evaluations given by clergy.

Newer bishops had more of a halo in council members' ratings than did those who had been bishops for some years. For eleven of the seventeen tasks, the more recent a bishop's ordination, the higher his rating by his council members; this was especially true in regard to "mediating conflicts in congregations." The newly elected bishop's "honeymoon" with the diocese may include being seen as superior in resolving church conflicts; however, newly elected bishops may also be better trained in conflict resolution.

Bishops, interestingly, do not seem to share council members' perceptions of their effectiveness under the same conditions. There are only two areas in which the length of time a man has been a bishop in the diocese can be associated with self-evaluations of effectiveness, and even then in terms of their experience in the episcopate rather than their newness. That is, the longer the period that bishops had been consecrated, the more likely they were to see themselves as effective in clergy deployment and in making

public statements on how the faith relates to social and national issues. In addition, a good number of the recently elected bishops reported that there were some conflicts among clergy in their dioceses especially regarding what they wanted the bishops to do. The greater the prevalence of varying opinions among clergy (or among diocesan commissions or committees) regarding the actions of the bishops, the less effective the bishops tended to believe they were in mediating conflicts in congregations and in various episcopal tasks. Especially in the area of "building and maintaining morale among clergy and lay leaders, and their enthusiasm for the future of the diocese," bishops facing internal group conflict(s) felt less effective than those who were not faced with this.

Eight of the seventeen activities which most bishops reported doing themselves at least part of the time were added together to form a scale of "Effectiveness in Core Episcopal Tasks." A similar--but not completely identical--scale was formed of seven items which at least three-fifths of the council members could observe sufficiently to be able to evaluate their bishop's performance in the area, the scale of "Effectiveness in Visible Episcopal Tasks."¹⁵

Both bishops and council members were more likely to rate themselves (their bishops) highly in terms of effectiveness on these scales if they saw a growth in Energy Available to the Diocese (scale) over the decade (as defined earlier). Conversely, bishops might be blamed or blame themselves if they or their council members saw no growth.

Bishops who rate themselves more highly than others in the Core Episcopal Tasks, and council members who rate their bishops more highly than others in the Visible Episcopal Tasks, are more likely to say they (their bishops) put quite a bit of emphasis on seeing that each of the roles of the bishops (as described in the last section) are accomplished for the diocese.

Not surprisingly, bishops who feel highly effective in their Core Episcopal Tasks are seemingly happier than bishops who feel less effective. Those bishops who have higher self-esteem in doing episcopal tasks in the diocese are also significantly more likely than those with lower self-esteem to say that their sense of fulfillment in ministry and success in developing new relationships with clergy and laity have increased since their consecrations. They are also more likely to say that during the last year they have felt successful in overcoming difficulties and obstacles in their ministries and comfortable in having political and economic clout, and that they thoroughly enjoyed their

ministries as bishops and are making a contribution to the life of their dioceses. Further, bishops with a higher self-esteem in the core episcopal tasks are less likely to feel the need for others to know them as people, and are quite significantly more likely than bishops with lower self-esteem to report higher levels of both personal and professional support from clergy and laity and, in particular, other bishops.

In contrast to the relatively effective bishops are the 25-35% who have the unpleasant position of feeling less than effective, somewhere between just surviving the skill demands of the job to actually having some difficulty in a number of areas. Feeling incapable of handling the demands of the position hardly helps bishops deal with the ongoing pressures, especially since it seems that bishops blame themselves (and are so blamed) for problems which occur in the diocese--even if a good number of these problems are beyond their control and may have been extant many years before they assumed the episcopacy.

One of the reasons that bishops do feel quite effective on the whole in the tasks of the episcopacy is probably, as noted earlier, because such a high proportion (78%) have been involved in some type of formally-offered continuing education during the last five years. This suggests that helping bishops feel more effective in those areas in which they see themselves as needing some assistance may improve both their self-esteem and their ministries.

C. Improving the Effectiveness of Bishops

Bishops were asked what they felt would increase the effectiveness of their leadership and ministry in the diocese, and council members were asked a similar question about what might help their bishops. Even though a slight majority of bishops already have had some formally-offered course or workshop in conflict management in the last five years, over 60% agreed that they could use additional learning opportunities in conflict management techniques, and nearly the same proportion of council members agreed this was an area in which their bishops could benefit from more education and training.

Nearly half (48%) of the bishops felt their ministry could be improved by further education in the classical areas of Bible, church history and theology, but their opinion was shared by only one-third of the council members; apparently most felt that their bishops were well-versed in the classics. About two-fifths of both bishops and council members felt their ministry (their bishop's ministry)

could be improved by courses or consulting in administration or financial management and/or in pastoral counseling techniques. Only about one-third of the bishops and council members believed that their (their bishop's) ministry would benefit from learning opportunities in speaking or preaching skills.

Bishops were open and sometimes eager to receive assistance or consulting in practical areas of their position, in particular such areas as how to stimulate church growth (76% at least somewhat agreed that they would like some assistance here). Between 50-68% of the bishops were at least moderately interested in having assistance or consultants to help them personally: be an effective spiritual leader; enable responsible innovation; deployment of clergy; how to receive hostility from others and deal with it constructively; and how to understand and apply the wisdom of experienced bishops. Thirty-seven percent wanted some assistance in "dealing with the media and making statements to the press."

Nearly half of the bishops (45%) would like some consulting in helping them delegate work effectively to others, a view shared by 49% of the council members. Even more bishops felt it was the need for more staff rather than increased learning on their part which would help them to be more effective administratively, 51% wanting more support staff and 50% more professional staff. It would also help, in the opinion of 59% of the bishops, if lay and clergy volunteers would accept the jobs delegated to them. This points to the possibility that bishops might welcome some consulting or courses in the recruitment, training and maintaining of volunteers.

Reality factors play a definite part in what bishops believe they need. For example, bishops in the poorer dioceses were significantly more likely than those in the wealthier dioceses to feel that having more support staff and professional staff would help them do the job, most probably because they were very understaffed. Interestingly, diocesan council members were most inclined to agree that giving the bishop more staff would help if they were also of the opinion that their bishop was quite effective in the core Visible Episcopal Tasks (scale). If they saw him as ineffective, they were unwilling to believe that giving him more staff would help; rather, in this situation, they believed he needed help in learning how to delegate effectively as well as in conflict management and in how to better match priest and congregation.

Bishops are considerably more interested in workshops, courses and consultants in areas of their ministry and work than they are in having their job goals defined. Less than one-third of the bishops agreed that their effectiveness would be increased by having some other group better clarify their job description. Only 31% of the bishops felt that diocesan commissions or committees could be of any real assistance in this respect, and far fewer (10%) felt that having their job goals more clearly specified by the House of Bishops would increase their effectiveness. Diocesan council members were only slightly more likely to feel that the House of Bishops' developing a job description for their bishop would make him more effective (29% agreeing), although far more liked the idea of the diocesan council alone--or in conjunction with other diocesan commissions and committees such as the Standing Committee--developing such a job description (45% agreeing this might make their bishops more effective).

Both bishops and council members in at least three-fourths majority believed that the bishop should take at least one day a week off as well as vacations for himself and his family, and that doing so would increase his effectiveness. A sizeable minority of bishops (42%) agreed that their effectiveness might be increased by their having a pastoral counselor to whom they could talk freely, as did a slight majority (55%) of council members. (Clergy were somewhat more likely to advocate this as a resource support for their bishops than were laity on the councils.)

Presumably, bishops feel some lack in themselves if they want more education, consulting, or help in particular areas. However, bishops who feel highly competent in the core episcopal tasks (scale) are just as likely as those who feel less than competent in many such tasks to want a number of the courses or consulting in areas listed on the survey. Bishops who felt less effective and had lower self-esteem in the task areas of the episcopate were only more likely than those with higher esteem to want their job goals more clearly specified. (This makes sense, as other correlations indicate that one reason bishops may feel ineffective is precisely because they are often facing situations where members of different leadership groups--such as Standing Committee or diocesan council--are expecting different things of them, and having their job descriptions clarified by these diocesan groups might indeed improve their effectiveness.) Bishops with lower self-esteem in tasks of episcopal ministry were also somewhat more likely to want some consulting help in administration or financial management, and some assistance in how to enable responsible innovation.

Bishops who have been in the episcopacy for a relatively short time are more likely than those who have been bishops for some years to feel their effectiveness would be increased by their being provided with more support staff and more staff specialists. But this may be more a function of the previously discussed fact that the newer bishops tend to be found in the smaller dioceses which have fewer staff, rather than to their being relatively inexperienced bishops. However, the fact that recently consecrated bishops are more likely than those who have had long episcopates to want the opportunity to share in the wisdom of experienced bishops indeed seems due to their newness to the office.

Although size of diocese was not significantly related to whether bishops felt they were competent or somewhat less than competent in the core episcopal tasks (scale), size of the diocese was related to bishops' indications that they wanted help. Bishops in smaller dioceses were significantly more likely to want help in twelve of the twenty listed areas. What in part may be occurring is that bishops in the larger, richer, better staffed dioceses who feel less than competent can delegate some of the areas in which they feel weak to others or easily get assistance if they desire. In contrast, if bishops in the smaller dioceses feel weak in various core areas of their ministry they must still almost always attempt to do the work to the best of their ability. Not only is it difficult (if not impossible) to delegate many of their episcopal tasks to others, but they lack the funds to hire consultants or to go to many continuing education events. Hence, they feel a greater need for these resources to be provided to them. It is here again important to remember that small dioceses are not the happiest places for bishops who come to them as strangers. Thus, for all of these reasons, bishops in small dioceses are more likely to desire the services of a professional counselor to whom they can talk freely.

Although providing bishops with consultants, courses and more staff may indeed help them be more effective in their varied episcopal duties and ministries, bishops who have lower self-esteem in terms of their effectiveness also lack supportive professional relationships, both personal and professional, with other clergy and especially other bishops. Such support and friendship may be equally important not only in helping bishops to feel effective but to be effective. This will be discussed in the next section.